

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 12-15 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Without conceding the appropriateness of the rejection, claims 14 and 15 are amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to obviate this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,097,518 to Scott et al. (hereinafter "Scott") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,297,217 to Hamilton Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Hamilton"); and rejects claims 2 and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Scott in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,367 to Shyu et al. (hereinafter "Shyu") and Hamilton. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Without conceding the interpretation, or application, of the applied references, and solely to advance prosecution of this application, claims 1, 2 and 12-15 are amended to clarify relevant features. For example, claim 1 recites, among other features, a first memory that stores the pixel value information input in the raster scan order, the first memory having a capacity less than a main scanning direction width of the image data. Claims 2 and 12-15 recite similar features. The applied references cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested such features.

For example, the Office Action relies on Scott as allegedly disclosing a corresponding first memory. The Office Action relies on source image memory 1610 of Scott as allegedly corresponding to this feature. However, as stated in col. 46, lines 25-32, the source image memory 1610 stores a complete bit map of the bi-tonal pixel values that form the source

image. Such features do not correspond to a capacity less than a main scanning direction width of the image data. The other references are not applied in a manner to overcome the above-identified shortfall in the application of Scott to the subject matter of the pending claims.

Additionally, it would not have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify Scott in such a manner without impermissibly altering Scott's method of operation.

For at least the above reasons, the applied references cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of features positively recited in independent claims 1, 2 and 12-15. Additionally, claims 3-11 would not have been reasonably suggested by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-15 over the applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay, II
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:JEG/clf

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: April 4, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--